

The
VISION
OF THE
EVENING AND THE MORNING

A Study of the Prophecy of
Daniel VIII.

BY
JOHN KOLVOORD
AND
MOSES E. KELLOGG

“And the vision of the evening and the morning which
was told is true.”—*Daniel viii. 26.*

BATTLE CREEK, MICHIGAN

AN EXAMINATION OF THE 1844 TIME THEORY

BY MOSES E. KELLOGG.

THE prophetic symbols of the book of Daniel have long been the cause of much study and exposition, often combined with considerable speculation. The study of these, as of all scripture, is profitable, and perhaps such study and attempted exegesis is impossible without some degree of speculation; but when the speculation is of such a nature that its acceptance leads to a great religious excitement and almost world-wide movement, culminating in the disappointment and consequent loss of faith in the hearts of thousands of sincere people, it would be better, to say the least, had such speculation not been indulged. As most of our readers are probably aware, the prophetic period contained in Daniel 8, commonly treated of and referred to as the 2,300 days, was the basis of the wide-spread belief of many people that Christ would make his second advent to this world in the year 1844. It is also as well, perhaps better, known that nothing of the kind occurred; and although sixty-three years of time have elapsed since 1844, the looked-for event has not yet transpired.

The disappointment of those who expected the return of Christ in 1844 was keenly felt by all who had preached and believed the doctrine, and having made considerable stir in the world, and drawn upon

themselves a large amount of adverse criticism, they were very reluctant to give up the idea that they were entirely wrong in their exposition of the prophetic symbols. To maintain their position in the face of the fact that nothing such as they had predicted had occurred, some made new discoveries in prophetic reckoning by which the time was somewhat prolonged; but the last date set by these zealous but evidently misguided persons has long passed by, and no reputable people who take the name of "Adventist" now have any fixed time for the coming of Christ and the end of all things,—time having fully demonstrated the futility of such calculations.

It may be here remarked that the scripture most used to prove that Christ would come in 1844 does not state that Christ would come at any time, but that "Unto two thousand and three hundred days then shall the sanctuary be cleansed." Dan 8:14. The deduction from this text was that the word "sanctuary" meant the earth, and that the cleansing would be by fire.

The passing of the set time with nothing that could be seen to mark the alleged ending of the prophetic period developed another theory,—that the sanctuary referred to in the text is in heaven; and that the cleansing is the last work of Christ as the Mediator and High Priest of the Christian age, the work corresponding to that of the Jewish high priest under the Levitical law; and as the work of cleansing or justification of that Levitical sanctuary occupied

only the last day of the yearly round of services, and probably only a part of that day, it was argued that this period of cleansing would necessarily be very brief and that at its close Christ would come.

The writer will here make the frank statement that he for many years held the last-mentioned view, but he would add that he was not one of the original 1844 Adventists. He never passed through the period of disappointment, but inherited his faith in the 1844 sanctuary-cleansing theory from those who first received it, and accepted it at a time when from youth and the lack of a proper knowledge of history he was unable correctly to weigh evidence and to decide for himself in an intelligent manner matters of so grave importance.

Those who have held to the theory of the sanctuary in heaven to be cleansed, beginning at 1844, have often contended with those who maintain that the earth is the sanctuary, that the long period of time that has elapsed since 1844 is proof positive that they are wrong in their views; and now it strikes the writer with great force that they also may retort against those who hold the heavenly sanctuary theory that time has also demonstrated the fallacy of their position. Indeed, we believe it to be a fact that all those who have looked for the end of the prophetic period of Daniel 8 at any time in this or any subsequent time, are wandering in the dark, and that time, instead of relieving their minds by the realization of their hopes, will only plunge them deeper into

perplexity, further disappointment, gloom, and despair.

It is, therefore, the part of wisdom for those who have been holding this view, carefully to consider this prophecy again, studying it as though they had never studied it before. They should also be willing to give up any preconceived view, no matter how dear it may be to them or how truly believed and honestly advocated by men whom they have held and may still hold as men of the highest Christian character, recognizing the fact that through all time good men make mistakes in their calculations.

We now, therefore, invite those who read these lines to study with us anew this prophecy.

THE PROPHEPIC SYMBOLS.

The symbols of this chapter are (1) a ram with two horns; (2) a he-goat with a certain remarkable development of horns; (3) a prophetic period commonly referred to as the 2,300 days.

Of the first symbol it is necessary to say but little, as the angel in his explanation to Daniel declared that the ram represents the Medo-Persian kingdom. The goat is, also, declared to be a symbol of Grecia, and the great horn that was between his eyes, and that was afterward broken, is explained to signify the first king. As Alexander, commonly called the Great, was the first Grecian king that combined all the Grecian states in a war against a foreign power, and particularly as the subsequent division of his em-

pire into four Grecian kingdoms is in exact harmony with the symbols, students of prophecy, without respect to creed, have universally declared that the great horn symbolized Alexander, and that the four horns that came up in its place, when the great horn was broken, represented the four kingdoms of Macedon, Thrace, Syria, and Egypt, into which the empire of Alexander was divided.

So far Bible expositors are generally in harmony with each other; but concerning the next development there is a variety of opinions: "And out of one of them [the four horns of the goat] came forth a little horn, which waxed exceeding great, toward the south, and toward the east, and toward the pleasant land. And it waxed great, even to the host of heaven; and it cast down some of the host and of the stars to the ground, and stamped upon them. And an host was given him against the daily sacrifice by reason of transgression, and it cast down the truth to the ground, and it practiced and prospered." Dan. 8:9-12.

Of this little horn that came out of the one of the horns of the goat, really a king or power that came out of one of the four kingdoms into which the empire of Alexander was divided at his death, there is difference of opinion, chief of which are (1) that it is a symbol of the Syrian king Antiochus Epiphanes, one of the Syrian line of Greek kings; (2) that it is a symbolic prophecy of the Roman power in its two forms of Pagan and Papal Rome.

Of those who have held these divergent views of

the prophecy, the earliest Bible expositors claimed that the Syrian king Antiochus Epiphanes was meant. Later, some Protestant commentators thought that they saw in the prophecy of this power an outline of the Roman empire.

ANTIOCHUS AND NOT ROME.

After having studied these views and the grounds for the same with great carefulness, the writer is of the opinion that the earliest Biblical expositors are right, and that the little horn of Daniel 8 is used in this prophecy to represent Antiochus Epiphanes and his sacriligious attacks upon the Jewish people and the profanation of their sanctuary, which he accomplished.

We would first remark that as the angel distinctly stated that the rough goat was a symbol of Grecia, it therefore follows that all that pertains to it is Grecian. The great horn in the forehead of the goat was a symbol of a Greek king, Alexander. The other four notable horns that came up when the great horn was broken were also Greek dynasties, as all must admit. It is therefore perfectly consonant with reason to conclude that the last-mentioned little horn that came out of one of the Greek horns is also Greek, and it would be inconsistent to hold that it was anything else.

It is also a fact that Rome did *not* come out of any of the Greek kingdoms. Rome, in its rise, was entirely outside of the Greek dominions. The Ro-

mans were a rising and strong people in the days of Alexander; and, at the time of his conquests, they declared that had he turned his arms in their direction, they would have taught him a lesson. The most able exponent of the view that the little horn is a symbol of Rome, can only say upon this point that as Rome had conquered Macedon, one of the Greek kingdoms, B. C. 168, and made its league with the Jews, B. C. 161, "it therefore *appeared* to the prophet, or may be properly spoken of in this prophecy, as coming forth from one of the horns of the goat."—*Thoughts on Daniel*, p. 154.

Of this statement it may be said that the prophet is not telling what appeared to him, but what really was, and Rome did not really come out of any one of the Greek kingdoms. It grew for centuries before it even came in contact with any of the Greek states.

Notice further the time of the rise of the little horn power: "And in the latter time of their kingdom, when the transgressors are come to the full, a king of fierce countenance and understanding dark sentences shall stand up." Dan. 8:23.

It is remarkable how those who hold the little horn to be a symbol of Rome, slip over this very important chronological statement, "In the latter time of their kingdom." Whose kingdom?—The four kingdoms that rose out of Alexander's broken empire. Then the Greek kingdoms of Alexander's successors had not passed away when the little horn arose, and hence Rome had not yet come into the field of proph-

ecy when the little horn performed its work. If Rome were the power referred to, it would be *following* the four kingdoms and not *in their time*. The fact that this little horn kingdom existed and acted "In the time of their kingdom," is absolute proof that it did not reign and act in the time allotted to Rome for the performance of its work, and that it is one of the Greek kings. Notice also the similarity of the language used in Daniel 8, to that used in the Apocrypha in describing Antiochus Epiphanes: "And after his [Alexander's] death they [Alexander's servants] put crowns upon themselves, so did their sons after them many years, and evils were multiplied. And there came out of one of them a wicked root, Antiochus Epiphanes." 1 Mac. 1:9, 10.

We are now ready to inquire at what time in the line of the Syrian Greek kings were the reign and wicked exploits of Antiochus Epiphanes.

The first of the Seleucidea, or Syrian line of kings, was Seleucus, who began to reign B. C. 306. This line of kings continued until B. C. 65, or 241 years. Antiochus Epiphanes reigned from B. C. 175 to 164. He therefore began to reign when 131 years of the Seleucid dynasty was in the past; and as he reigned to B. C. 164, and as the Seleucid empire came to an end B. C. 65, he reigned 131 years from the beginning of the line and to within 99 years of its end. He therefore reigned in the *latter part* of the Seleucid line of kings. And since all the Greek kingdoms came under the power of Rome at nearly the same

time, the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes was, as this prophecy declares, "in the latter time of their [the Greek powers'] kingdom."

Again, the whole work of the little horn carries the impression that it is one single king rather than that of a long line of kings, or a government that covered many centuries. Its work was accomplished "in the time of their kingdom" (the Greek successors of Alexander), whereas the career of Rome was continued for many centuries after the Greek empires had perished.

It is an axiomatic truth, accepted by all Bible students, that the connection of any power with the people of God is the cause of its introduction into prophecy. Now, if the little horn be a symbol of Rome, it could not begin its work as a desolating power before B. C. 161, when its famous league with the Jews was made. As a matter of fact, Rome was at first the protector of the Jews, and did not begin a warfare against them until about A. D. 70, when, because of their rebellion, Titus took Jerusalem. If Rome is intended by the little horn, and it has 2,300 years of warfare against the people of God to perform, then we must look for 2,300 years of time from A. D. 70. There is no evading this conclusion.

THE CAREER OF ANTIOCHUS.

Before we proceed any further, we will put together all that is said of this power whose identity we are seeking to ascertain.

“And out of one of them came forth a little horn which waxed exceeding great, toward the south and toward the east, and toward the pleasant land: and it waxed great even to the host of heaven; and it cast down some of the host and of the stars to the ground and stamped upon them. Yea, he magnified himself even to the prince of the host, and by him the daily sacrifice was taken away, and the place of his sanctuary was cast down. And an host was given him against the daily sacrifice by reason of transgression; and it cast down the truth to the ground; and it practiced and prospered.” Verses 9-12.

Add to this the angel's explanation: —

“And in the latter time of their kingdom, when the transgressors are come to the full, a king of fierce countenance, and understanding dark sentences, shall stand up. And his power shall be mighty, but not by his own power; and he shall destroy wonderfully, and shall prosper, and practice, and shall destroy the mighty and the holy people. And through his policy also he shall cause craft to prosper in his hand; and he shall magnify himself in his heart, and by peace shall destroy many: he shall also stand up against the Prince of princes; but he shall be broken without hand.” Verses 23-25.

We have already proved that Antiochus Epiphanes reigned at the right time to fulfill this prophecy, ~~and that Rome did not~~. Now let us further study the career of this king.

Did Antiochus Epiphanes make any conquest in

the south?—He did. He conquered Egypt and made it a part of his empire. Proof: “Now when the kingdom was established before Antiochus Epiphanes, he thought to reign over Egypt, that he might have dominion over two realms. Therefore he entered Egypt with a great multitude, with chariots, and elephants, and horsemen, and a great army, and made war against Ptolome, king of Egypt; but Ptolome was afraid of him and fled, and many of them were wounded to death. Thus they got the strong cities in the land of Egypt, and he took the spoils thereof.” 1 Mac. 1:16-19.

What did he do in the east? He ravaged Persia and Armenia with fire and sword. Proof: “He [Antiochus Epiphanes] resolved to divide his forces into two parts, to give command of one of his armies to Lysias, descended from the royal blood, in order that he might subdue the Jews, and marched the other into Armenia and afterwards into Persia, to reinstate the affairs of those provinces in their former flourishing condition. . . . After passing Mount Taurus he entered Armenia, defeated Artaxias and took him prisoner. He marched from thence into Persia where he supposed he would have no further trouble of that rich province and those in its neighborhood.” Rollin, Book 18, p. 136.

What were his operations in the pleasant land?—He took Jerusalem and murdered a vast number of the Jews,—the mighty and the holy people. The terrible butcheries and other crimes of the most shock-

ing character that he committed on the people of Israel are recorded in the first book of the Maccabees and in Josephus' and Rollin's histories. Those who defend the view that the little horn is a symbol of Rome, are very careful never to mention these acts of Antiochus Epiphanes.

Again, in exact harmony with the prophecy, Antiochus Epiphanes took away or, in other words, stopped the daily sacrifices of the Jews and had heathen sacrifices offered in their place: "Now the fifteenth day of the month Casleu, in the one hundred forty and fifth year, they [Antiochus Epiphanes and his army] set up the abomination of desolation upon the altar, and builded idol altars throughout the cities of Judea on every side, and burnt incense at the doors of their houses and in the streets." 1 Mac. 1: 54, 55.

The book of Maccabees also tells how the sanctuary was trodden down and defiled:

"And behold our sanctuary, even our beauty and our glory is laid waste, and the Gentiles have defiled it." 1 Mac. 2: 12.

Again: "Now Jerusalem lay void as a wilderness, there was none of her children that went in or out: the sanctuary also was trodden down and aliens kept the stronghold: the heathen had their habitation in that place, and joy was taken from Jacob, and the pipe with the harp ceased. For thy sanctuary is trodden down and profaned, and thy priests are in heaviness and brought low." 1 Mac. 3: 45, 51.

“A king of fierce countenance.” These words could not apply to a long line of kings of various characters and dispositions. They do exactly describe Antiochus Epiphanes, who was a man in whom all noble thoughts were dead. He is held up by all historians as a perfect example of a ferocious tyrant. “He caused craft to prosper in his hand.” By the high honor he bestowed upon such of the Jews as would give up their religion, he made a peace that destroyed many souls. The expression “host of heaven” which is said to have been cast down by him, must be a figurative allusion to the dignitaries of the Jewish people. Those who were like the stars in the darkness, and who refused to give up the worship of Jehovah were destroyed without mercy. The high priest was deposed and a renegade Jew was placed in his room. These works were not accomplished by his own power, but God permitted him to punish his people because of their transgressions.

Thus in every particular the history of Antiochus Epiphanes fulfils the prophecy of the little horn of Daniel 8. And if the reader will take the pains to study the first book of the Maccabees, in the apocryphal scriptures, and Josephus’ and Rollin’s histories, he will find many other confirmatory proofs that we have not space to use in this brief treatise.

OBJECTIONS ANSWERED.

At this time it is proper that a careful and candid consideration should be given to certain arguments

that are used to sustain the idea that Antiochus Epiphanes is *not* the one whose career is symbolized by the little horn of Daniel 8.

1. It is argued that Antiochus Epiphanes could not be the little horn and at the same time a part of the horn from which he sprang. Or, as an able and honest exponent of the view that Rome is the subject of this prophecy thus expresses it: "Antiochus Epiphanes, then, was simply one of the twenty-six kings who constituted the Syrian horn of the goat. He was for the time being that horn; hence could not be at the same time a separate and independent power or another and remarkable horn as the little horn was."—*Thoughts on Daniel*, pp. 151, 152.

The Syrian horn certainly includes Antiochus Epiphanes, but it could hardly be said that any one of its twenty-six kings at any time constituted that horn. It took them all together to make it. The four notable horns were symbolic of four *dynasties*. The reader will also recall the fact that the goat was a symbol of the whole Grecian empire from the first to the last, but at the same time one horn on the head of that goat was a symbol of one individual king, Alexander, as all admit. Now just as the goat was a symbol of Grecia as a whole, and at the same time the one notable horn in its forehead represented one king, so the Syrian horn represented the whole line of the Syrian kings, the dynasty,—but the little horn that came out of it represented one king of the line whose career the Lord wished especially to de-

scribe. Did the Lord wish to foretell with minuteness the history of one king of this Syrian line, how else better could he do it than by describing it as a little horn coming out of a larger one? As before remarked, the whole Greek empire, in all its phases and divisions, is symbolized by the goat and its various development of horns; and it would be highly incongruous to speak of Rome as being in any way evolved from the Greek empire.

2. "If it were proper to apply this symbol to any one of the Syrian kings, it should certainly be applied to the most powerful and illustrious of them all. . . . Although he took the name Epiphanes, that is, The Illustrious, . . . some thinking him a fool and others a madman, they changed the name of Epiphanes into Epimanes, or the 'Mad Man.'"—*Thoughts on Daniel*, p. 152.

Precisely, and for the very reason that he "magnified himself in his heart" and called himself the "illustrious," when he acted like a mad man, is the best reason why his career is noted in prophecy. The other kings of his line did not wage a cruel and relentless warfare against the people of God, did not take away the sacrifice, did not profane the sanctuary and tread it under foot, and so they are not introduced into the prophecy in any specific manner. As before stated, the connection of any power with the people of God is a special reason that attention is called to it in the prophetic scriptures. There was surely abun-

dant reason for such attention in the career of Antiochus Epiphanes.

3. The Romans finally gained the ascendancy and compelled Antiochus Epiphanes to evacuate Egypt.

This proves nothing in the case. All the Greek kingdoms were in the end subdued by Rome, but they acted their part just the same.

4. The little horn is called exceeding great in comparison with Persia and Greece, which could not be true in regard to Antiochus Epiphanes.

It is an entirely gratuitous assumption to say that the power represented by the little horn is in the scriptures declared to be "exceeding great" in comparison with any power. The prophet institutes no comparison between the little horn and any other power. It is not called a great horn: it is not even spoken of as a notable horn. On the contrary, it is emphatically described as "a little horn," but is said to have waxed "exceeding great" in three directions which are specified; namely, the south, east, and the pleasant land. This was true of Antiochus Epiphanes, who from a small beginning became great in tyranny and oppression of the Jewish people. On the contrary, Rome was far from being a little power at the time it was first introduced into prophecy. Again, if Rome were the subject of this prophecy, the prophet might have said it waxed great toward the north, and toward the west as well as toward the east, for Rome extended its power in all directions. This is especially true of the popes of Rome, who are held to be included in

this prophecy of the little horn. In the east Rome has lost much, the Greek church and Mohammedanism having taken that portion of the world, but the barbarous tribes of the west of Europe, that broke up the western empire of Rome, were the chief support of the papacy during the middle ages, and still farther west, in the two Americas, the pope has millions of adherents and supporters.

THE DAILY SACRIFICE.

Another feature of this remarkable prophecy must here be considered: The crowning act of impiety of this power was that it took away, or caused to cease, the sacrifices of the Jewish nation which were ordained of God and which were a most solemn and impressive part of his public worship. This Antiochus Epiphanes did, as we have already noted.

Right here those who hold the view that the little horn is a symbol of Rome, oppose by saying that as the word "sacrifice" is not in the original text of Daniel's prophecy, but is a word supplied by the translators, the daily sacrifices of the Jews are not meant, but that something else that goes on every day is referred to. They then contend that the word "daily" means paganism and that the "transgression of desolation" (Dan. 8:13) means Papal Rome.

This is nothing but assumption without a particle of proof. The translators supplied the right word in order to make clear to the readers of English the same idea which the word "daily" alone signified in

the original. The word "daily," by long usage, had come to be the shortened way of reference to the "daily sacrifice." It is somewhat remarkable, to put the case mildly, how persons of no unusual endowments of scholarship deny to the learned men who translated the Scriptures the right to add the word "sacrifice," while at the same time these would-be critics of their own accord cheerfully add the word "desolation."

One writer thus states his view: "The idea of sacrifice does not attach to the word 'daily' at all." —*Thoughts on Daniel*, p. 157.

But pray tell us how the word *desolation* attaches to the word? The word "daily" conveys the idea of *continuity*, and that is the very idea that pertains to the sacrifices. "Now this is that which thou shalt offer upon the altar, two lambs of the first year day by day *continually*." Ex. 29-33. See also Num. 28: 3-10.

It was to be a *continuous* act of national public worship, and its suspension would be a heaven-daring affront to Almighty God. Concerning the word "daily" Gesenius, who is the highest authority on Hebrew text says: "Adjective used as substantive, continual, perpetual, daily, as moving on continually without interruption; *a continual burnt offering or sacrifice; i. e., continued daily both morning and evening.*" Davies in his "Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon" gives the word this definition: "Continuance, burnt offering of continuance, *i. e., continued daily burnt offering.*" Bevan,

a noted Bible scholar, gives the following free translation of the text in question: "How long is the vision to be while the daily sacrifice is taken away and the iniquity set up from the time when he will tread down the sanctuary and the service." Again he says: "Continuance, daily, *stands in Daniel and in the Talmud for the continual daily offering.*"

From these quotations and definitions from eminent authorities (and many more might be added) it is evident that the translators in supplying the word "sacrifice" only gave to the reader of English the same idea that the language of the original conveyed to those who read that language.

NOT A SYMBOL OF TWO POWERS.

The attempt to make the little horn a symbol of the Roman empire and also of the papal church,—a kind of dual symbol and yet one power succeeding the other,—involves those who hold that view in many absurdities. Thus we read: "This little horn must be understood to symbolize Rome in its entire history including its two phases, pagan and papal. . . . In the actions ascribed to this power, sometimes one form is spoken of and sometimes the other. By him (the papal form) the daily (the pagan form) was taken away. Pagan Rome was remodeled into papal Rome, and thus the place of his sanctuary, the city of Rome, was cast down."—*Thoughts on Daniel*, p. 154, 155.

Was there ever such a remarkable juggling of words to make it appear that one horn represents

two powers? Really, separated from the descriptive phrases enclosed in brackets, the writer quoted would have it read thus: By the little horn the power of the little horn was taken away, and the place of the sanctuary of the little horn was cast down!

There is absolutely nothing in the text to prove or suggest that the power under discussion has two phases. This is but a device to make the symbol cover something to which it has no relation whatever. A little more good common sense and not so much freedom taken with personal pronouns and antecedents is a better way of treating this text. The reader will also notice that it is assumed that pagan Rome had a sanctuary located in Rome! But in the same book from which we have already made several quotations the author describing the Jewish sanctuary, says: "This is the only sanctuary *connected with the earth* concerning which the Bible gives us any instruction or history any record." p. 168. How then about that heathen sanctuary in Rome referred to by the same writer on page 155 of same book? The memory of the author of that book must have been at fault there. But we believe that the latter statement is correct, and that both the Bible and history are silent as to any other earthly sanctuary than the Jewish sanctuary.

Then instead of one phase of the little horn trampling down another phase of the same horn,—a most preposterous assumption,—we have the clear and logical statement that the little horn, a unit in its en-

tirety, tramples upon and pollutes the sanctuary of the Jewish people, the sanctuary of Jehovah. This is precisely what Antiochus Epiphanes did.

THE PRINCE OF PRINCES.

It is further urged that Antiochus Epiphanes could not stand up against the Prince of princes since Christ was not then born. But granting that Christ is here referred to, the existence of Christ prior to his incarnation in the flesh and his direction of his people is an accepted doctrine with all Christians. In the days of Joshua he appeared to that leader of Israel as the "captain of the Lord's host." Joshua 5:14. He was just as truly the Prince of princes before as after his incarnation, and any power that rose against his chosen people was opposing him.

THE DEATH OF ANTIOCHUS.

In closing this part of the subject a word upon the tragic death of Antiochus Epiphanes is in order: Learning that the Jews under their renowned leader, Judas Maccabeus, had defeated his army in Palestine and reestablished the sanctuary service, he determined to destroy all the Jewish people. While making a hurried march in that direction, he was seized with a fatal sickness and soon died acknowledging with his last breath that he was being punished for the miseries which he had brought upon the Jewish people. 1 Mac. 6. Thus was fulfilled the prophecy concerning the little horn that he should be broken without hand.

TWO DESOLATING POWERS.

The claim that two desolating powers, paganism and the papacy are predicted in Daniel 8, will now be further considered.

We readily grant that in order to understand the book of Daniel we must recognize the fact that in its prophetic scope it describes two desolating powers, but these are not two phases of the same power. The work accomplished is similar in many respects, though the work of the two may be readily separated and defined. These two powers may be called the Syrian abomination and the Roman abomination. That there was a Syrian abomination the following is proof: "Now upon the fifteenth day of the month Casleu, in the one hundred forty and fifth year they [referring to Antiochus Epiphanes and his followers] set up the abomination of desolation upon the altar and builded idol altars throughout the cities of Judea on every side." This apocryphal scripture is absolute proof that there was a Syrian abomination of desolation, and that it trod down and profaned the sanctuary.

But there was also a Roman abomination referred to in Dan. 9:26, 27: "And for the overspreading of *abominations* he shall make it desolate, even until the consummation, and that determined shall be poured upon the desolate." Marginal reading: "And upon the battlements shall be the idols of the desolator." This is the abomination which Christ spoke of when long this side of the defiling of the sanctuary by the

Syrians, he said, "When ye therefore shall see the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet, stand in the holy place, . . . then let them which be in Judea flee into the mountains." Matt. 24:15.

To recapitulate: The Syrian king Antiochus Epiphanes took away the Jewish sacrifices; profaned the sanctuary and trod down the truth of God as then represented by the Jewish people, destroying many thousands of them; magnified himself and practiced and prospered; but from this defilement the sanctuary was cleansed and worship reestablished there by Judas Maccabeus and his brethren within the time specified in this prophecy, as we shall later see. The Romans also polluted the sanctuary and placed there the abomination that maketh desolate, but they did more. "And the people of the prince that shall come shall *destroy* the city and the sanctuary." Dan. 9:26. "And for the overspreading of abomination he shall make it *desolate*, even until the consummation, and that determined shall be poured upon the desolate." Verse 27.

It is worthy of especial notice, in this comparison of these two powers, that in Daniel 9, where Rome is so certainly and conspicuously brought to view there is no charge made that the sacrifices were taken away, but only that the sanctuary was destroyed. This omission to mention the sacrifices in connection with the placing of the Roman abomination when so much stress is laid upon this act when

done by the Syrian king, is readily understood from the fact that the virtue of these sacrifices had ceased when Christ, the great Sacrifice, expired upon the cross, over thirty years before. Then the veil of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom (Matt. 27:51). After that it was a useless service, not worthy of mention.

We must then conclude that from every line of argument bearing on this question Antiochus Epiphanes is symbolized by the little horn of Daniel 8. He took away the Jewish sacrifice, thus for the time suspending the public national act of worship commanded by Almighty God; he established a heathen worship in Jerusalem and throughout the Judean cities; he trod down the sanctuary and desolated the country; he put to death, by many cruel ways of torture, those who held fast to their religion.

THE TWENTY-THREE HUNDRED DAYS.

We now come to a very important, probably the most important, point in the study of this prophecy: Since the prophecy of the little horn relates to the impious acts of the Syrian king Antiochus Epiphanes, the question regarding the length of the period of desolation also relates to this same power. In other words, the question, "How long shall be the vision concerning the daily sacrifice, and the transgression of desolation, to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot?" (Dan. 8:13), is a question regarding the length of time that Antiochus Epiph-

anes would be allowed to tread down and pollute the sanctuary. And the answer to that question, "Unto two thousand and three hundred days, then shall the sanctuary be cleansed," also relates to that same Syrian king and gives the time of his career against the people of God, and the date of the undoing of his work by the cleansing of the sanctuary and the restoration of the daily sacrifices as commanded in the law of Moses.

Before going farther upon this subject, it is necessary to state, with more minuteness than we have heretofore done, the position taken in reference to this prophecy by those who looked for the coming of Christ and the end of the world in the autumn of the year 1844.

The theory advanced by those zealous but evidently misguided people was that the little horn of Daniel 8 is a symbol of Rome. But as the civil power of Rome expired in the fifth century and as these expositors were anxious to lengthen out the prophetic period so as to make it reach to their own time, it was held that this horn included Rome in its papal as well as its pagan form. That is, that the rule of the popes of Rome was included in the scope of this prophecy. And so the prophetic period was stretched out to cover the time-history of those powers. To do this it was held that the 2,300 days were symbolic of the same number of years. The next effort was to find a starting-point for these years. There is nothing in the eighth chapter of Daniel that gives any clue to

the time of the commencement of this period, and they therefore sought it in the following chapters. Chapter nine contains a vision and prophecy of seventy weeks reaching from a specific point of history to Messiah. Following are the words: "Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people. . . . Know therefore and understand that from the going forth of the commandment to restore and build Jerusalem unto Messiah the Prince shall be seven weeks and threescore and two weeks." Dan. 9:24, 25.

Beyond question the time of the beginning of the seventy weeks is here given. But that was not what the expositors of the 1844 time theory wanted. They desired an event or point of time for the beginning of the 2,300 days, and as they found none in Daniel, they decided to take the same date as that of the beginning of the seventy weeks!

No other Bible expositors, as far as we know, had up to that time ever held that there was any connection between the 2,300 days of the eighth chapter and the seventy weeks of the ninth chapter. That discovery was left for the late William Miller. His argument was that one definition of the word rendered "determined" (Dan. 9:24) is "to cut off," and he concluded therefore that seventy weeks were cut off from the 2,300 days, and that the seventy weeks were the first part of the 2,300 day period. By this means he tried to make it appear that Christ would come in 1844, which at that time he ardently desired to prove.

The candid reader can but notice that this theory

that the seventy weeks are a part of the 2,300-day period is all pure supposition, and a very unnatural supposition at that. A much more reasonable conjecture would be that the seventy weeks were cut off or separated from all time as the limit of God's forbearance with the chosen people. Or that God "determined" that from the beginning of the period of restoration, which dated from this decree of the Persian king, the Jewish people should have seventy weeks or 490 years of favor. The same word "determined" is also used in verse 27 of the same chapter with precisely the same meaning; that is, something fixed or decreed. The Dutch translation reads "allotted," which exactly brings out the sense.

But having arrived at the conclusion above set forth that the seventy weeks were the first part of the 2,300-days period and that the days would expire in 1844, the next and absorbing question was what would then occur to mark the termination of the days. The text (Dan. 8:14) says nothing of the end of the world, but declares that at the end of the days the sanctuary would be cleansed. These expositors, however, were fully equal to the occasion. Some ambiguous texts that seem to convey the idea that the land of Canaan was the sanctuary were found, and from that attenuated basis they jumped to the most tremendous conclusion that the whole earth would be cleansed by fire in 1844!

The period of the excitement which the preaching of this doctrine caused, we do not care to de-

scribe. Neither men, their motives, nor actions are under discussion in this treatise. We are willing to let the mantle of kindly Christian charity cover them and all their doings, while we concern ourselves with facts which are apparent to all. The Lord did not come; the earth was not cleansed by fire or in any other way.

Soon after the passing of the set time without incident, another theory was advocated: that the sanctuary, referred to in the prophecy (Dan. 8:14), that was to be cleansed at the end of the days, was the sanctuary in heaven, where Christ as the High Priest of the Christian age ministers; that in harmony with its type—the Jewish sanctuary—it would be cleansed once, at the close of Christ's ministration; that this work of cleansing would only occupy a period of time commensurate with the similar work of the Jewish high priest, and that when this cleansing was accomplished the Lord would come. This cleansing was explained to be the work of judgment and the blotting out of the sins of all who had by repentance and faith obtained forgiveness.

At the first, some were inclined to think that as one whole day of the Jewish temple service was devoted to the cleansing of the temple, a proportionate portion of time would be used in the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary; that is, one-three-hundred-and-sixty-fifth part of the whole period of Christ's ministration. Assuming that he entered upon his work as intercessor upon his ascension to heaven A. D. 31,

and changed his ministration from the first to the second apartment of the heavenly sanctuary, to begin the cleansing of it in 1844, one-three-hundred-and-sixty-fifth part of that time would be between five and six years.

So if Christ should use the same *proportion* of the whole period of the time of his ministration for the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary that was used by the Jewish high priest in the cleansing of the Jewish sanctuary, the work should have been accomplished and Christ should have come before 1850.

Indeed, a very prominent exponent of the theory that Christ began to cleanse the sanctuary in heaven in 1844, and who claims to have the Spirit of Prophecy as the result of visions and revelations from the Lord, about 1850 said:—

“Some are looking too far off for the coming of the Lord. Time has continued a few years longer than they expected, therefore they think it may continue a few years more. . . . I saw that the time for Jesus to be in the most holy place was nearly finished, and that time can not last but very little longer.”—*Early Writings*, p. 49. But according to this theory he has now been engaged in the work of cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary over sixty-three years, or fifty-seven years since the work was “almost finished”! Allowing that his work in both apartments of the sanctuary has been carried forward ever since his ascension, that is, 1872 years, and that since the year A. D. 1844, he has been in the second

apartment cleansing the sanctuary, this cleansing has now occupied over one-thirtieth part of the whole time of his ministration thus far, instead of one-three-hundred-and-sixty-fifth part, as was the case of the Jewish temple. The comparison of the length of time as used by the Jewish high priest in his sanctuary, and that of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary is based on the supposition that the Jewish priests actually used the whole of one day in the work of cleansing,—something that can not be proved. Thus upon their own showing the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary is not yet accomplished although sixty-three years, or over one-thirtieth part of the time of Christ's whole intercessory work thus far has already been given to what is claimed to be his special and closing work.

It is not the intention of the writer to enter upon any discussion here in regard to the ministration of Christ as our mediator in the heavenly courts; that he acts in that capacity, we have no doubt, but we have very serious doubts that he goes through all the sprinklings, washings, and various maneuvers performed by the Jewish priests, or that he moves around from place to place during his ministration. Such performances would seem puerile and unnecessary. That Christ, upon his ascension, went into the holiest of all and into the very presence of God, is susceptible of the clearest proof. See Hebrews 1:3; 6:19, 20; 10:12, 19; 12:2; Acts 2:33; Rev. 3:21. In studying the work of Christ, compared with the Jewish types, it would be well for us to remember

the words of Paul, that the shadow of the good things to come is "not the very image of the things." Heb. 10:1.

Another unexplainable feature of the 2,300-day theory is that while this period is alleged to cover a time that a desolating power, claimed to be Rome, is treading down the people of God, the beginning of this period is placed 457 years before Christ, under the reign of a benevolent Persian king, centuries before Rome, or even Greece, which preceded Rome, came into the field of prophecy.

More than that: according to this theory the period of desolation dates from a decree of the Persian king, at that time the greatest monarch in the world, for the *restoration* of the temple and its services, a restoration which was actually carried out and which, with the exception of the interruption accomplished by Antiochus Epiphanes, lasted until the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans in A. D. 70.

It is therefore incumbent on those who hold this theory to tell in what way Rome trod down the sanctuary and the host during the three centuries in which it had no connection with the Jewish people or authority of any kind over the land of the sanctuary.

And as this little horn power was to tread down the sanctuary and the host during the whole of the 2,300-day period, and as the Mohammedan powers have held possession of the land of the sanctuary since A. D. 837, those who hold this view must also tell in what way Rome has trodden down the sanctuary since

it passed out from under Roman power? And since the treading down of the host and the sanctuary was to cease at the close of the period, claimed to end in 1844, they must also inform us in what way there has been any cessation of the treading down of the sanctuary and of the host since 1844. Their theory will not allow of any satisfactory answer to these very natural and pertinent queries.

A theory that causes such sad and tremendous disappointments and that is permeated with such far-fetched and illogical conclusions carries in itself the proof that it is radically wrong.

We therefore entirely discard the theory that Rome in any form whatever is represented by the little horn of Daniel 8, and take the more rational view that the Syrian king Antiochus Epiphanes is meant, evidence of which we have abundantly supplied.

NOT TWENTY-THREE HUNDRED YEARS.

Attention will now be called to the study of the prophetic period as a literal rather than a symbolic prophecy. And in order to bring it once more forcibly and clearly before the reader, another quotation of the text is here given: "Then I heard one saint speaking, and another saint said unto that certain saint which spake, How long shall be the vision concerning the daily sacrifice, and the transgression of desolation, to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot? And he said unto me, Unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the

sanctuary be cleansed." Dan. 8:13, 14. Really the question is this: How long shall this desolating power tread down the people of God and defile the sanctuary of Jehovah? and the reply is, that this desolation shall continue for twenty-three hundred days, and at the end of that period of time the sanctuary will be cleansed from its pollution.

Thus far, for the sake of convenience and facility of expression, we have referred to this prophetic period as the 2,300 days, but now, in the interests of truthful exposition, it is absolutely necessary to state that there is no such prophetic period as the 2,300 *days*. If the reader will look at the marginal reading of this text, it will be found to read thus: "Unto twenty-three hundred evening morning then shall the sanctuary be cleansed." The translators here put the word "day" in the place of evening morning, but these are left in the margin. This is *not* a case where a word or words are added to bring out the sense. The words "evening morning" are entirely omitted. These words are as well understood as any other words. Every one knows what the evening is, and what the morning is. The morning is the first part of the day, the evening, the last part. We say "Good morning" until noon; after that we say "Good evening." This expression is a very peculiar one. There must, therefore, be a good and sufficient reason for its use here. If the Lord had wanted to convey the idea of "days," he certainly would not have said "evening morning." This vision is specifically

referred to as "The vision of the evening and the morning." Dan. 8:26. Not that the vision was given in the evening or in the morning, but it had reference to something that was done evening and morning. Hence the expression, "Unto two thousand three hundred evening morning." To ascertain what was done, we have only to study the work of the little horn: "By him the daily sacrifice was taken away." Dan. 8:11. This was the crowning act of impiety and wickedness perpetrated by Antiochus Epiphanes. At what time were these sacrifices offered?—Every evening and every morning. "Now this is that which thou shalt offer upon the altar; two lambs of the first year, day by day continually. The one lamb thou shalt offer in the morning; and the other lamb thou shalt offer at even." Ex. 29:38, 39. Then it is apparent that the continuance of this power over the people of God for 2,300 evening mornings would mean just that same number of sacrifices interrupted or prevented. And it is also equally apparent that since there were two sacrifices offered each day, one in the morning and one in the evening, the desolation and treading down of the sanctuary would last *just half as many days* as there were evening mornings. We do not question the fact that sometimes a day in prophecy represents a year, but in this case even the word "day" is not in the original, as has been seen.

Another point must now be considered. There is no absolute agreement of the various versions of the scriptures as to the number of these evening morn-

ings. Our version, and probably the majority of the versions, makes it twenty-three hundred. The Vatican copy of the Septuagint reads twenty-four hundred. "The answer made to this question was, unto two thousand three hundred days, or as the LXX reads, twenty-four hundred days. Or as certain copies mentioned by Jerome read, "twenty-two hundred days."—*Scott's Commentary* on Daniel 8. What versions they were that give the period as 2,200 days, we have not as yet learned. But as they were referred to by the learned Jerome, who lived in the fourth century, they must have been among the earliest or oldest copies. As we look at this matter, it makes little practical difference which one of these versions is correct, since a proper understanding of the prophecy makes it clear that it does not greatly concern us, but it is well to know the truth of the matter, so as to avoid a false and misleading explanation.

No one now contends for absolute verbal inspiration and infallibility of all the WORDS in any translation of the Scriptures. None of the first MSS. are now in existence; and undoubtedly many copies of the older MSS. of the Old Testament were lost or destroyed before the oldest now in existence were taken. Thus there are slight variations between the different versions which in no way detracts from their validity. As to the point under discussion,—the number of days, or rather evening mornings,—there is only one way to ascertain which one, if any, of these periods, the 2,200, 2,300, or 2,400, is right. Find the

exact time when the daily sacrifice was taken away and the abomination of desolation set up. Then ascertain, if possible, when that abomination of desolation was taken away, the sanctuary cleansed of its defilement, and the worship of the true God resumed by the offering again of the daily sacrifices, that were commanded as the national act of worship of his chosen people. If the time so ascertained shall agree with any one of these periods, this agreement would be proof as strong as Holy Writ that that period is the right one.

A REMARKABLE FULFILMENT.

The attention of the reader is now invited to the first book of Maccabees. No one can deny that this apocryphal scripture is good history, nor can it be proved that it is not as truly inspired as the book of Daniel. The Jewish people have always held these apocryphal writings in the highest estimation. The text to which we will refer to find the exact date of the cessation of the Jewish sacrifice and the setting up of the abomination of desolation has been quoted before in this treatise, but will now be quoted again: "Now the fifteenth day of the month Casleu on the one hundred and forty and fifth year they [Antiochus Epiphanes and his hosts] set up the abomination of desolation upon the altar and builded idol altars throughout the cities of Judea on every side." 1 Mac. 1:54. Of the suspension of the daily sacrifices, read the following: "*A stop was put to both morning and*

evening sacrifices, not one of the servants of the true God daring to come and adore Him there.”—*Rollin's History*, Book 18, p. 13. Of the defilement of the sanctuary, the following testimony is offered: “This monarch [Antiochus Epiphanes] was one of the most cruel, rapacious, and tyrannical princes that ever achieved infamous immortality. He vented his wrath upon the Jews as though he were mad [crazy]. Onias III was high priest at that time. Antiochus dispossessed him of his great office and gave it to his brother, a Hellenized Jew, who erected in Jerusalem a gymnasium after the Greek style. But the king, a zealot in paganism, bitterly and scornfully detested the Jewish religion, and resolved to root it out. His general, Appollonius, had orders to massacre the people in the observance of their rites; to abolish the temple services, and the Sabbath, to destroy the sacred books and to introduce idol worship. The altar on Mount Moriah was especially desecrated and afterwards dedicated to Jupiter. A herd of swine were driven into the temple and there sacrificed; this outrage was to the Jews ‘the abomination of desolation’ which could never be forgotten or forgiven.”—*Jewish Heroes*, by John Lord.

Another well-known historian makes the following statement: “The conqueror [Antiochus Epiphanes] marched without delay against Jerusalem, put to death in three days’ time 40,000 of the inhabitants and seized as many more to be sold as slaves. . . . He entered every court of the temple, pillaged the treasury, seized

the sacred utensils and the golden candlesticks, the table of shewbread, the altar of incense, and thus collected a booty to the amount of 1,800 talents. He then commanded a great sow to be sacrificed upon the altar of burnt offering, part of the flesh to be boiled, and the liquor of the unclean animal sprinkled upon every part of the temple, and thus desecrated with the most defilement the sacred place the Jews had considered for centuries the one holy spot in the universe.”—*Milman's Works*, Book 9, pp. 506, 507.

After reading the foregoing statements, can any one doubt that the sanctuary was polluted, or that this impious act of defilement and the subsequent cleansing of the holy place should be made a matter of earnest inquiry and explanation? Much more evidence upon this point might be adduced.

In this extremity, the Jewish cities desolated, their sanctuary trodden down and polluted, their national acts of worship prevented, and a large number of the Jews becoming the open and avowed adherents of Antiochus and his pagan worship, the Lord raised up a mighty deliverer in the person of Judas Maccabeus.

If the reader has never read the first book of the Maccabees, he should do so at the first opportunity. After reading, he will be ready to agree with the following statement:—

“After the heroic deeds of Joshua, Gideon, and David, no warriors appeared in Jewish history equal to Judas Maccabeus and his brothers in bravery, in patriotism, and in noble deeds. They delivered the

Hebrew nation when it had sunk into abject submission, under the kings of Syria, and when its glory and strength alike had departed. . . . No hero that chivalry had produced surpassed him in courage and ability; his exploits would be fabulous and incredible if not so well attested. He is not a familiar character, since the apocrypha, from which our chief knowledge of him and his deeds is derived, now rarely are read." *"Jewish Heroes,"* by John Lord, p. 429. Of the war waged by this Jewish hero for the delivery of his people and the recovery and purification of the temple, it is only necessary to describe the final results that mark the fulfilment of the prophecy under consideration. Describing the gathering of his small army, Rollin says: "He [Judas] made much use of this place (Maspha) because as Jerusalem was in the hands of their enemies, and the *sanctuary trampled* upon, they could not assemble in it to solemnize that religious act." Book 18, p. 137.

After the signal defeat of the Syrians by Judas and his small band of heroes, the first act of the victors was to cleanse the defiled temple and restore the sacrifices. The Syrians still held the strong military tower of the city, but Judas did not wait for victory over this force. "Judas took precautions to keep a body of armed men upon the watch against the Syrian garrison in the citadel and then proceeded to install the most blameless of the priests in their office; to repair the sacred edifice, to purify every part from the profanation of the heathen, to construct a new

altar, to replace out of the booty all of the sacred vessels, and at length to celebrate a feast of dedication, a period of eight days,—which ever after was held sacred in the Jewish calendar.”—*Milman's Works*, Vol. 2, pp. 14, 15.

Another historian has given the following graphic description of the cleansing and the dedication of the sanctuary:—

“Judas had now leisure to cleanse the sanctuary and dedicate it. . . . He pulled down the defiled altar of burnt offering and rebuilt it. *Cleansed the sanctuary*, hallowed the desecrated courts, made new holy vessels, decked the front of the temple with crowns and shields of gold. . . . When all was cleansed and renewed, a solemn service of reconsecration was celebrated; the sacred fire was kindled on the altar, thousands of lamps were lighted, the sacrifices were offered, and the people thronged the courts of Jehovah, and with psalms of praise, festive dances, harps, lutes, and cymbals made a joyful noise unto the Lord. It was forever after, as long as the temple stood, held a sacred yearly festival and called the Feast of Dedication.”—*Jewish Heroes*, by John Lord, p. 452.

Read also the following from a Jewish historian:

“The work of restoration was carried on with such ardor that the inauguration of the temple could take place on the 25th of Kisleu, the self-same day on which, three years before, Antiochus had the worship to cease, and had defiled the temple by dedicating

it to Jupiter Olympus. This anniversary of a profanation predicted centuries before as the 'abomination of desolation' (Dan. 11:31), but from which the Lord had now vouchsafed, with 'a strong hand and outstretched arm,' to cleanse his altar and his sanctuary, so that the day had indeed been changed 'from sorrow to joy, from mourning into feasting,'—this anniversary now so glorious was ushered in with all imaginable solemnity. At the earliest dawn, the priests' trumpets were sounded; a new fire was kindled by the striking of two fire-stones, and as soon as the flames ascended to heaven, the lamb of the daily sacrifice was offered, the lamps were lighted, the usual portion of incense was burned, and every other part of the divine service performed according to the law of Moses; and from that day it was not again discontinued until the last siege of Jerusalem by Titus."—*Post-Biblical History of the Jews*, by Raphael, Vol. 1, pp. 262, 263.

Can any person of a candid mind read the foregoing and fail to see that the career of Antiochus Epiphanes, his destruction of the mighty and holy people, the profanation of the temple which he accomplished, his final defeat, tragic death, and the cleansing and rededication of the sanctuary, and the restoration of the worship of God in the place and way he appointed is the fulfilment of the prophecy of Daniel 8?

Here was a pollution of the sanctuary that all can understand. No fancy is required to grasp the idea. It was a real pollution, testified to by many reputable

witnesses, and described by writers of both sacred and common history. The same is true of the cleansing. It was no idealistic figment of the imagination, but a real transaction, vouched for by reputable historians in as clear and veracious a manner as any event of history. The sanctuary was polluted and trodden down; it was also cleansed of its pollution and rededicated to the worship and service of God, according to the prophecy.

But the most important statement in reference to this cleansing is yet to come. We have reserved it to the last because it is the original description, as given in the apocrypha, and especially as it gives the *date* of the cleansing—the crucial test of the prophetic period that covers the time of the desolation of the temple and the suspension of the daily sacrifices: “Then said Judas to his brethren, Behold our enemies are discomfited; let us go up to cleanse and dedicate the sanctuary. . . . So he chose priests of blameless conversation, such as had pleasure in the law, *who cleansed the sanctuary* and bare out the defiled stones into an unclean place. Now on the five and twentieth day of the ninth month (which is called the month Casleu) in the hundred forty eighth year, they rose up betimes in the morning and offered sacrifices according to the law upon the new altar of burnt offering, which they had made. Look at what time, and what day the heathen had profaned it, even in that was it dedicated with songs, and citherns, and harps, and cymbals. Moreover, Judas and his breth-

ren with the whole congregation of Israel ordained that the days of the dedication of the altar should be kept in their season from year to year by the space of eight days, from the five and twentieth day of the month Casleu, with mirth and gladness." 1 Mac. 4: 43, 52-56, 59.

This is the feast of dedication referred to in John 10: 22.

Let us now give close attention to the length of time between the desecration and the cleansing of the sanctuary as here described.

It is plainly stated that the abomination of desolation was set up on the fifteenth day of the month Casleu in the one hundred and forty-fifth year.

Casleu is the ninth month of the year, as may be seen by consulting any Jewish table of months, and as it is plainly said to be in the description of the cleansing at the end of the period of desolation. The cleansing took place on the 25th day of the 148th year. From the 15th day of Casleu on the 145th year to the 15th day of Casleu on the 148th year there would be 37 months, which at $29\frac{1}{2}$ days to a month would amount to 1,091 days. Add to this the 10 days from the 15th day of Casleu to the 25th day, when the sanctuary was cleansed, would make the whole time 1,100 days, completing the period of desolation and treading down and marking the day of cleansing.

Eleven hundred days, and two sacrifices a day, would exactly harmonize with the 2,200 evening-

morning period, and marks the readings that give that length of time as the right ones. And certainly there would not be one chance in a million that the number of days between these two events, the desecration and the cleansing of the sanctuary, would come out right to a day with any one of these periods, the 2,200, 2,300, or the 2,400, unless it were the right period. This explanation amounts therefore to a demonstration; no other explanation that has ever been offered does. If it had been in harmony with the time as given in our version, it would have been no better or clearer. We challenge any student of the prophetic Word to find another prophecy in the Scriptures that has had a more remarkable and absolutely accurate fulfilment; and we may well join with the angel in exclaiming, "And the vision of the evening and the morning which was told is true." Dan. 8:26.

Notice, too, the striking manner in which attention is called to the day and date of the cleansing: "Look at what time and what day the heathen had profaned it." Why notice the time unless somewhere God in his Word had foretold the work of this evil power, and had stated the time of its continuance.

Right here we wish to make a very interesting and important quotation from the great Jewish historian, Josephus:—

"Daniel wrote that he saw these visions in the plain of Susa, and he hath informed us, that God interpreted the appearance of the vision after the following manner: He said that the ram signified the

kingdom of the Medes and Persians, and the horns those kings that were to reign in them; and the last horn signified the last king, and that he should exceed all kings in riches and glory; that the he-goat signified that one should come and reign from the Greeks who would twice fight with the Persians and overcome him in battle, and should receive his entire dominion: that by the great horn which sprang out of the head of the he-goat was meant the first king; and the springing up of four horns upon its falling off, and the conversion of every one of them to four quarters of the earth signified the successors that should arise after the death of the first king and the partition of the kingdom among them, and that they should be neither his children or his kindred, that they should reign over the habitable earth for many years; and that from among them should arise a certain king, that should overcome our nation and our laws, and he should take away our political government and spoil the temple, and forbid the sacrifice for three years' time. And indeed it so came to pass that our nation suffered these things under Antiochus Epiphanes according to Daniel's vision and what he wrote many years before it came to pass."—*Antiquities of the Jews*, Book, 10, pp. 199, 200.

From this statement several important deductions may be clearly drawn:

1. Josephus believed that Antiochus Epiphanes was symbolized by the little horn of Daniel 8.
2. That the prophetic period of that chapter gave

the length of the period of desolation that Antiochus brought upon the Jewish people.

3. That he did not believe that period was one of many hundreds of years.

4. That he did not believe it was a period of time as long as 2,300 literal days; for he said it was only three years, and 2,300 literal days would be over six years.

5. He must therefore have computed the time by the number of sacrifices prevented; that is, by evening mornings, an evening and a morning for each day.

One further statement in reference to this time period: If we allow that the evening mornings represent days, and the days represent years, and that they commenced B. C. 457, we are now nearer the end of the 2,400-day period than we are to the end of the 2,300-day period. That is to say, we are now nearer to A. D. 1944 than we are to A. D. 1844, having passed the half-way mark in A. D. 1894. We are therefore not surprised to learn that some persons have already transferred their faith to the 1944 date, and are now looking forward to A. D. 1944 with the same anticipation that their fathers in faith looked for the end of the 2,300 days and the coming of the Lord in A. D. 1844, for—

“Error cherished long, e’en when confessed,
With deep reluctance leaves the human breast.”

CLEANSING OF THE HOLY PLACE.

But there may be those who have so strongly imbibed the idea that the sanctuary in heaven must be cleansed that they may still feel that even if the cleansing of the sanctuary referred to in Daniel 8 was the earthly sanctuary, and that that cleansing is past, still the sanctuary in heaven must at some time be cleansed.

As our effort is to assist all who have held this erroneous view to see the mistake into which they have been drawn, it seems proper to give more especial attention to the work of Christ as related to the heavenly places.

As a sacrifice for sin, Christ was the antitype of the sacrificial offerings ordained by the law of Moses. But it would not be proper for us to claim that in the treatment he received previous to his death, or in the manner of his death, there was to be an *exact parallel* with the sacrifices that prefigured his sacrifice. It is enough that in a broad and general sense he was a sacrifice for our sins.

The same principle holds true in regard to his mediatorial work. No person can really believe that he will do all things that the priests of old did; nor is it necessary to believe that he will minister for a certain length of time in one apartment of the sanctuary in heaven, and then in another. "Heaven itself" is said to be the place of his ministry, and the texts which prove that upon his ascension to heaven he went immediately into the very presence of God,

have already been cited and need not be referred to again.

The attention of the reader is now invited to the book of Hebrews, and especially to the texts that are claimed to prove that the heavenly sanctuary will be cleansed. "Now when these things were thus ordained, the priests went always into the first tabernacle accomplishing the service of God. But into the second went the high priest alone once every year, not without blood, which he offered for himself, and for the errors of the people. The Holy Ghost thus signifying that the way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest while as the first tabernacle was yet standing." Heb. 9:6-8.

In the above quoted words the work of the Jewish high priest on the day of atonement is referred to, but *not to say* that Christ would cleanse the sanctuary in heaven, but *only* to say that that act signified that the way into the holiest of all—heaven—was not then manifest. In other words, that the God-man, Christ Jesus, would enter heaven itself as our mediator, was not then manifest or understood, and that was what that act of the high priest signified. Now however, knowing it, we can "enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus." Verse 19.

"But," says one, "is it not stated that it is necessary that the heavenly things must be purified?"—Yes, but this was not a cleansing from sin. There is no such statement in the Scripture anywhere or anything equivalent thereto. A fatal mistake in Scrip-

ture exposition has been made in thinking that the purification of the heavenly things referred to in Heb. 9:24, is the antitype of the cleansing of the earthly sanctuary on the great day of atonement as described in Lev. 16:19.

A careful study of Heb. 9:24 with context will make it apparent to every candid person that no reference is there made to the work of the Jewish high priest on the day of atonement. The comparison is not between the high priest and Christ, but between the work of Moses and that of Christ as it is in other places in the same book; and the work described is not the cleansing of the sanctuary from sin, *for Moses never cleansed the sanctuary*, but it is the ratification of the covenant and the dedication of the sanctuary by Moses before the services in that earthly sanctuary could begin. Thus we read: "For when Moses had spoken every precept to all the people according to the law, he took the blood of calves and of goats, with water, and scarlet wool and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book, and all the people, saying, This is the blood of the testament which God enjoined unto you. Moreover, he sprinkled with blood both the tabernacle, and all the vessels of the ministry. And almost all things are by the law purged with blood; and without shedding of blood is no remission. It was therefore necessary [referring to the work of Moses] that the patterns of things in the heavens should be purified with these; but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these. For Christ is not

entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us." Heb. 9: 18-24.

Please study this scripture carefully. The dedication or purification of the sanctuary by Moses and the better things that Christ does is the topic. The blood of calves and water was used with the blood of goats, but on the day of atonement the blood of only one goat was taken into the sanctuary, or used in any way for the cleansing. On the day of atonement the priest took the blood of the goat and put it upon the horns of the altar and sprinkled it upon the altar seven times (Lev. 16: 18, 19). But in the comparison in Heb. 9: 24, Moses sprinkled all the vessels of the ministry, the book of the covenant, all the people and the tabernacle itself, and dedicated it. So Christ, when he entered the "holiest" in heaven, dedicated it, or purified it by his own blood. *It was all done when he entered it.* There he is now in the presence of God as our mediator, and there has been no change in his ministration since he first entered it.

Notice particularly that the Apostle refers to this work of Moses as a dedication (verse 18); and that the word here translated "dedicated" is from the same Greek word that in Heb. 10: 20 is translated "consecrated." This is absolute proof that the dedication or consecration of the heavenly places by Christ's blood and presence there is what the apostle is considering, and that the purification referred to by the apostle as

typical of Christ's work was the ceremonial purification incident to the dedication of the sanctuary by Moses, and not the annual cleansing of the sanctuary as accomplished by the Jewish high priest. The heavenly places were purified or dedicated when Christ entered them; they will never need to be cleansed from sin, and there is no scripture stating that such a cleansing of the heavenly places will ever occur.

A FRAGILE BASIS.

In closing, a few more remarks in regard to the 1844 time theory may be ventured:

The theory rests upon a frail basis of suppositions and assumptions not one of which is susceptible of absolute proof or demonstration.

1. It is assumed that the little horn of Daniel 8 is (a) symbolic of the civil and military power of Rome, (b) and also of the Roman Catholic Church as represented by the popes.

2. It is assumed that the ninth chapter of Daniel is subsidiary to, and an explanation of, the eighth chapter.

3. It is assumed that the "evening mornings" mean days.

4. It is further assumed that each day stands for, or represents, a year.

5. It is assumed that the seventy weeks of Daniel 9 are cut off from the 2,300 days.

6. It is assumed that the 2,300 days began where the seventy weeks are said to begin—B. c. 457.

7. It *was* assumed that the sanctuary to be cleansed at the end of the period was the whole earth.

8. And now it is assumed that the sanctuary to be cleansed is in heaven and that though sixty-three years of time have passed since that work began, still the cleansing is not yet finished.

Were there ever such remarkable calculations and tremendous conclusions based upon so weak, fallacious grounds? If a chain is no stronger than its weakest link, what should be said of a chain of evidence every link of which is faulty? Is it any wonder that, at the time when the period was supposed to close, nothing whatever occurred; that the sun rose and set as usual, and all the operations of nature went on as before?

Of the men who made these fallacious, speculative calculations, and who are, to say the least, measurably responsible for the consequences, we have nothing to say. Their honesty we do not question. How much their judgment was biased and warped by their very strong desires, no man can tell. That must be left for a higher power than man to decide, and surely the Judge of all the earth will do right. Nor do we desire by what is here written to cast any aspersion or slur upon any church or upon any individuals who may help to compose such church that has held and promulgated such views. But we wish to call attention to the certainty that their calculations are wrong; and the longer a church clings to any false theory

the more certain and disastrous will be the final consequences.

Finally, the writer would say for himself that no personal pique or desire for any gain or notoriety of any kind has prompted him in this work. *It is as painful for him as it can possibly be for any other person.* He would be exceedingly glad to believe all that he was early taught was the truth upon the subject herein presented. There is no people, as a whole, that he loves as he does that people who still believe this theory. All his early associations and the mature years of his manhood were spent in closest labor and harmony with them, and nothing that is here said should be construed as a denial of the great Biblical truth that Christ will return to earth, or that that return is an event not far in the future. But sometimes the thought lies heavily upon the writer's heart that not only the setting of time for the coming of the Lord, but even for the beginning of some unseen work in heaven, supposed to be preparatory for that coming, by over-zealous believers, has caused much more harm than good,—actually resulting in unbelief in that which should be firmly believed by all Christians. For because of it the great truth of the coming of the Lord has thus been seen by many only through the dim fog caused by wild and unnecessary speculations followed by deferred and blasted hopes and most bitter disappointment.

To expect that all who have heretofore believed the theory here controverted, will upon reading this

treatise, at once openly renounce their former belief in the 1844 time theory, in which is bound up so many years of faith and faith's activities, would doubtless be expecting too much; but we do believe that the positions herein taken are so clear and the proofs so convincing that it will be studied with the serious attention that so important a subject demands, and that it will have the effect, sooner or later, of changing the minds of many persons,—eventually leading them away from wild speculations and fanciful interpretations of scripture to the solid ground of truth, historic fact, reason, and enlightened common sense.